



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/604,975	03/25/96	TAYLOR	K ITI-169

MICHAEL I WOLFSON
COWAN LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN
1133 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK NY 10036

QM61/1006

EXAMINER	
BRINSON, P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3753	13

DATE MAILED: 10/06/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/604,975

Applicant(s)
Kevon Charles Taylor

Examiner
Patrick F. Brinson

Group Art Unit
3753



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, and 5-10 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 12

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1-10 all recite "characterised in that". It is suggested that "characterised in that" be changed to "wherein" in order to put the claim language in more standard English format. Likewise, claims 1 and 9 recite "register with" and "for register with", respectively. It is suggested that language such as "aligned with" replace "register with" in order to clearly convey the relationship between the lateral pipe and the tubular structure aperture. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites "characterised by tailored inflation member...". There is no structural connection between the inflation member and the assembly of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT

Application WO 91/16568 to **Wood** .

The PCT Application WO 91/16568 discloses an assembly for forming a cure-in-place lining to a region of a lateral/main pipe connection, including a length of tubular structure (38) for application to the main pipe surface (10) to each side of the lateral connection pipe (12). The length of the tubular structure including a wall aperture that is aligned with the lateral pipe and a lateral extension, fig. 7, (14) tubular structure extending from the aperture and for extending into the lateral pipe. The lateral tubular structure and collar (100) being formed of a resin impregnated material, and it is disclosed that the collar remains in place around the lateral aperture. The tubular structure is not disclosed as having a resin impregnated layer, however, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the tubular structure (38) with a resin impregnated layer in order to alternatively seal around both sides of the lateral extension as is done in the **Wood** reference by the collar (100).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 5-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Serial Number: 08/604,975
Art Unit: 3753

3

5. Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Kamiyama et al. '719, '873, '033, 'and 401, Wood, Endoh, Lippiatt, and Rice are all pertinent to Applicant's invention in disclosing methods and devices for lining pipes, in particular those having lateral extensions.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **PATRICK F. BRINSON** whose telephone number is (703) 308-0111.


PATRICK F. BRINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Tech Center 3700

P. F. Brinson
September 29, 1998